

Application Number 09/938,144
Responsive to Office Action mailed March 22, 2007

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUN 22 2007

REMARKS

This amendment is responsive to the Office Action dated March 22, 2007. Applicant added claim 32. Claims 1-6, 16-22, 24-26 and 28-32 are pending.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 5, 16-19, 22, 24-26, 29 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stefanksy (US 6,226,143) in view of Schneider (US 6,363,487). The Examiner also rejected claims 2, 6, 20 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stefanksy in view of Schneider as applied to claims 1 and 18 above, and further in view of Glover (US 6,282,045) and rejected claims 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stefanksy in view of Schneider in view of Glover as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Durrett (US 5,964,830). The Examiner rejected claim 31 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stefanksy in view of Schneider as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Durrett and rejected claim 28 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stefanksy in view of Schneider as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of well known in the art.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections. The applied references fail to disclose or suggest the inventions defined by Applicant's claims, and provide no teaching that would have suggested the desirability of modification to arrive at the claimed invention.

Deficiency Common to Each of the Current Rejections

As a preliminary matter, Applicant requests the Examiner consider that each of the pending independent claims: claims 1, 16 and 18, recite both an application program and an operating system running the application program. The application program and the operating system as claimed are separate and distinct elements. Accordingly, a proper rejection needs to account for the each of these elements and explain why it would have been obvious to include both elements in a device as claimed at the time of Applicant's invention. Applicant respectfully asserts that each of the current rejections fail in this regard.

Application Number 09/938,144
Responsive to Office Action mailed March 22, 2007

Claims 1-6, 25, 26, 30 and 31

In the rejection of claim 1, the Examiner interpreted microcontroller 224 of Stefanksy as being equivalent to a central processing unit as recited in claim 1. The Examiner further cited Stefanksy, column 8, lines 25-40 as disclosing that microcontroller 224 runs an operating system. For reference, this portion of Stefanksy is reproduced below:

With reference to FIG. 14, a microcontroller 224 and a minimum number of dedicated control support circuits direct all functions of disk drive 18. In the preferred embodiments of the present invention, microcontroller 224 is a three megahertz clock rate Motorola MC68HC11 HCMOS single chip microcontroller, as described in the MC68HC11A8 HCMOS Single Chip Microcomputer Technical Data Book (ADI 1207) available from Motorola, Inc., Motorola Literature Distribution, P.O. Box 20912, Phoenix, Ariz., 85036.

A read-only memory (ROM) 226 is coupled to the microcontroller 224 by way of a general purpose data, address and control bus 240. The ROM 226 is utilized to store a microcontroller control program for supporting five principle tasks necessary to implement the full functionality of the disk drive 18. These tasks include interface, actuator, spin motor, read/write and monitor.

The Examiner failed to explain how the above passage relates to an operating system as recited in claim 1. Applicant notes that the above passage simply illustrates that microcontroller 224, "directs all functions of disk drive 18" apparently through a "microcontroller control program." However, the microcontroller control program in Stefanksy is not equivalent to an operating system. According to the 10th Edition of Merriam-Webster's Online Dictionary¹, accessed December 7, 2006, an operating system is "software that controls the operation of a computer and directs the processing of programs (as by assigning storage space in memory and controlling input and output functions)." Stefanksy fails to disclose that microcontroller 224 operates any program other than the microcontroller control program and also fails to disclose that the microcontroller control program directs the processing of other programs. For example, Stefanksy fails to disclose that programs other than the microcontroller control program even exist. In this manner, Stefanksy fails to disclose an operating system and the Examiner's rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner respond

¹ <http://www.m-w.com/dictionary/operating%20system>.

Application Number 09/938,144
Responsive to Office Action mailed March 22, 2007

to the above argument, which was also made in Applicant's communication filed December 11, 2006.

Furthermore, in the Office Action with respect to claim 1, the Examiner acknowledged that Stefanksy fails to disclose the feature of wherein the data disc stores an application program run by the operating system as claimed, but that it would have been obvious to modify the disc drive of Stefanksy to incorporate such a feature in view of Schneider. In support of this point, the Examiner cited column 4, lines 5-16 of Schneider.

However, the portion of Schneider cited by the Examiner is related to an operating code for micro-controller of a secure disc drive.² Importantly, Schneider fails to consider that the micro-controller may run an operating system running an application program. In this manner, Schneider fails to overcome the deficiencies of Stefanksy as discussed above such that the subject matter of claim 1 would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention.

Glover and Durrett also fail to overcome the deficiencies of Stefanksy in view of Schneider. For this reason, dependent claims 2-6, 25, 26, 30 and 31 are allowable for at least the reasons independent claim 1 is allowable. Furthermore, the dependent claims include additional features that would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention.

For example, with respect to claim 5, the Examiner cited Stefanksy as disclosing a three and one half inch form factor. However, because Stefanksy fails to disclose each of the features recited in claim 1, e.g., a CPU running an operating system, Stefanksy fails to teach one of ordinary skill in the art that such combination of features can fit into a package as small as a three and one half inch form factor. In fact, none of the applied references would have made it obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention that the combination of features recited in claim 1 could fit into a package as small as a three and one half inch form factor.

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the rejections to claims 2-6, 25, 26, 30 and 31.

² Schneider, column 4, lines 5-16 and column 5, lines 20-23.

Application Number 09/938,144
Responsive to Office Action mailed March 22, 2007

Claims 16, 17 and 28

As discussed previously with respect to claim 1, Stefanksy in view of Schneider fail to teach or suggest a processor running an operating system running an application program as claimed. Similar features of a memory mounted on the PCB storing an application program, wherein the application program is run by the operating system running in the CPU are recited in claim 16. Therefore, the cited references would not have made the subject matter claim 16 obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention.

Dependent claims 17 and 28 are allowable for at least the reasons independent claim 16 is allowable. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the rejections to claims 16, 17 and 28.

Claims 18-22, 24 and 29

As discussed previously with respect to claim 1, Stefanksy in view of Schneider fail to teach or suggest a processor running an operating system running an application program stored on a data disc. Similar features of a memory mounted within the case, wherein the memory stores an operating system, and the central processing unit runs the operating system, wherein the operating system runs application software stored on the data disc are recited in claim 18. Therefore, the cited references would not have made the subject matter claim 18 obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention.

Glover fails to overcome the deficiencies of Stefanksy in view of Schneider. For this reason, dependent claims 17 and 28 are allowable for at least the reasons independent claim 18 is allowable. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the rejections to claims 18-22, 24 and 29.

For at least these reasons, the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case for non-patentability of Applicant's claims 1-6, 16-22, 24-26 and 28-31 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

Application Number 09/938,144
Responsive to Office Action mailed March 22, 2007

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUN 22 2007

New Claim

Applicant has added claim 32 to the pending application. The applied references fail to disclose or suggest the inventions defined by Applicant's new claims, and provide no teaching that would have suggested the desirability of modification to arrive at the claimed inventions. No new matter has been added by the claim 32.

CONCLUSION

All claims in this application are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt allowance of all pending claims. Applicant does not acquiesce with any of the Examiner's current rejections or characterizations of the prior art, and reserves the right to further address such rejections and/or characterizations.


Please charge deposit account number 50-1778 \$50.00 to cover the cost of one additional dependent claim. Please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to deposit account number 50-1778.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the below-signed attorney to discuss this application.

Date:

June 22, 2007
SHUMAKER & SIEFFERT, P.A.
1625 Radio Drive, Suite 300
Woodbury, Minnesota 55125
Telephone: 651.735.1100
Facsimile: 651.735.1102

By:


Name: Daniel T. Lund
Reg. No.: 58,614